

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a); Claims 17 and 25 have been objected to as not complying with U.S. patent practice and procedure; Claims 17-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite; Claims 17-20 and 25-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Nagy; Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nagy in view of Epperson; Claims 23-24 and 31-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nagy in view of Sauer; and Claim 21 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-16 have been previously canceled and thus, Claims 17-32 remain active.

Considering first then the Examiner's objections to the drawings, it is to be noted that appropriate amendments have now been made to Claim 23 to claim that the coupling electrode comprises at least one coupling electrode, which is illustrated in the figures, and reference to an electric heating element in Claim 30 has been deleted. It is therefore submitted that the claims as now amended comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.183(a). Responsive to the Examiner's request, the specification has now been amended so as to contain the proper titles.

Considering next then the Examiner's objection to Claims 17 and 25, such claims have now been appropriately amended as suggested by the Examiner.

As for the rejection of Claims 17-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, appropriate amendments have been made to Claim 17 for compliance with U.S. patent practice and procedure.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 17-20 and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Nagy, Applicants note that Claim 17 has been amended to specify that the at least one thin wire starts from the zone at the side edge of the glazing and is returned exclusively to the zone of the side edge with at least one fold so that two ends of the wire are situated exclusively in the zone of the side edge of the glazing. Thus, as shown in Figure 1, the wires of the electrode are positioned at only one side edge of the glazing so that the at least one thin wire starts from the same zone that is returned to. This clearly differs from the arrangement in Nagy which requires substantially the entire peripheral surface of the window shown in Figure 1 to be utilized to as to effectively serve as a solar-ray antenna system formed in the windshield of a vehicle. In this regard, it is noted that the leads for the coaxial cable 56 and coaxial cable 44 are at opposite positions of the windshield and thus do not teach the provision for at least one wire starting from a zone at the side edge of a glazing and returning the wire exclusively to such zone so that each ends of the wire are exclusively situation in the zone of the side edge of the glazing, as presently claimed. The resulting advantages of a reduction of the area of the window necessary to provide the antenna glazing is thus not realized in Nagy and Nagy clearly requires substantially more structural features to properly function, unlike the present invention which serves to significantly reduce the number of parts necessary to provide an effective antenna glazing for automobiles. It is further submitted that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nagy so as to meet Applicants' claim limitation and any attempt to do so would destroy Nagy for its intended purpose and function.

Each of Claims 18-20 and 25-29 contain additional limitations which, it is submitted have no corresponding teaching or disclosure in Nagy or any of the remaining references of record. In view of these limitations and in view of the dependency of such claims either directly or indirectly upon Claim 17, it is submitted that Claims 18-20 and 25-29 also merit indication of allowability.

Considering next then the rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nagy in view of Epperson and the rejection of Claims 23-24 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nagy in view of Sauer, it is respectfully submitted that neither Epperson nor Sauer rectify the deficiencies noted hereinabove with respect to Nagy regarding Claim 17. It is therefore submitted that each of Claims 22-24 and 31-32 also merit indication of allowability with the same being hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner's indication that Claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is hereby acknowledged and is sincerely appreciated. Accordingly, Claim 21 has now been placed in independent form and has been appropriately amended for compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.


In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421
Attorneys of Record

GJM:JDH\la

I:\ATTY\JDH\000000 CASES OF 2007\JUNE\280287US-AMENDMENT\280287US-AM.DOC